

REMARKS

By this paper, claim 72 has been amended. Claims 35-72 are pending.

In the outstanding Office action dated December 15, 2003, claim 72 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claim 72 has been amended so that it now depends from claim 67 so that proper antecedent basis is established.

Moreover, in the outstanding Office action, claims 35-41, 45, 46, 50, 51, 54-60, 64, 65, 69 and 70 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,227.

Moreover, claims 35-52 and 54-71 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,215; claims 35-43, 45, 46, 50, 51, 53-62, 64, 65, 69, 70 and 72 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 14, 29, 30, 35, 39 and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,720; and claims 35-43, 46, 50, 51, 54-62, 65, 69 and 70 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,753.


In response thereto, Applicants have submitted herewith a Terminal Disclaimer which operates to disclaim the terminal part of the statutory term which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,361,215; 5,550,753; 5,559,720; and 6,253,227. It is believed that submitting such a Terminal Disclaimer operates to traverse the rejection of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as set forth in the outstanding Office action.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have attempted to completely respond to the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office action. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims allowed and the application passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP



John V. Hanley
Registration No. 38,171

JVH/kt
Fulwider Patton Lee & Utecht, LLP
Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Tele.: (310) 824-5555
Fax: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
49251.1